

EX-70 ONLY

24 November 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Operations

SUBJECT: Mark Clark Committee Members' Visit to ORR,
24 November 1954

1. From 0910 to 1030, Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder met with Chief, Economic Research, and his division and staff chiefs. Ch/E outlined to them the organization of the area, the authority under which it operates, the consumers of its production, and procedures for accomplishing research. In general, Colonel Miller's questions were on who did what, how they did it, and why they did it. He did not seem at all concerned about substantive conclusions. In addition, Colonel Miller seemed not to be aware of, or at least not to appreciate the possibility of, determining actions by conference or by staff study and concurrences, such as decision in an EIC subcommittee as to what gaps could appropriately be filled by CIA, or decision among division chiefs as to which should be the action division. He seemed always to be seeking to learn who was the competent higher authority who issued all orders and made all decisions. Following are the more important topics discussed:

a. Colonel Miller was interested in the division of intelligence responsibilities under DCID 15/1, particularly military-economic research. He asked what percentage of total economic research on the Soviet Bloc was accomplished in ORR. While this exact percentage is difficult to pin down, we estimated that about 75 percent of the production within the economic sector of the intelligence community was carried out in ORR. Colonel Miller asked why we did not do the complete job and was told that the responsibility for military end items and certain other military specialties were the responsibilities of the individual Services, but that a merger with the Air Force would bring under one centralized direction over 90 percent of the personnel currently devoted to economic research on the Bloc.

b. Colonel Miller was interested in relationship with NSA and in reports which evaluated specific sources. Two of these have been completed and will be made available in this office to Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder if they decide to review them.

c. Colonel Miller was concerned about the timeliness of our Current Intelligence Support operation; after the general presentation in Ch/E's office, he spent about ten minutes going over the specific details of such support.

010166

25X1A

2. The Committee Representatives next visited the Industrial Division, and were briefed by the division chief and by [REDACTED] from 1045 to 1200. The Committee Representatives were shown an organization chart of the division indicating commodities handled by branches, and were also shown a representative selection of published reports of this division. The following topics were discussed:

a. The T/O of the division and the ratio of clerical to professional personnel.

b. The question of conflicts or overlaps of division activities with those of the other IAC agencies.

c. The reason for the assignment of Techniques and Methods Division to the Coordination Area.

d. The relationship between D/I and the Industrial Register and the reasons why the Industrial Register was so far from this division.

e. Possible conflict between the work done in the Shipbuilding Branch (the only branch that time permitted the Representatives to visit) and ONI.

3. Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder were next briefed by the Acting Chief, Services Division, and his two assistants from 1330 to 1410. The following topics were discussed:

a. The division mission and functions, the definition of "services sector of the economy," number of branches in the division, and the division T/O with distinction between professional and clerical.

b. Reasons for T/O vacancies, and whether staffing was according to needs or according to a rigid T/O.

c. Possibilities of duplication in functions within CIA and within the intelligence community, particularly as to: whether Basic Division couldn't produce all the intelligence needed on population and manpower and what measures had been taken to avoid duplication with Department of State functions; the method by which the EIC subcommittee in this field operated; the number of studies produced in population and manpower within the last two years by agencies other than CIA; possible overlap between the interests of Services Division and those of Industrial in the Industrial Labor Force; and any measures taken to avoid duplication in other fields.

4. The Acting Chief, Materials Division, and his Deputy were interviewed by Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder from 1410 to 1450. During the course of the discussion the following questions arose:

a. Would it not be better to carry straight through on intelligence coverage of ferrous metals into the production of end items, such as those handled by the Industrial Division? For example, would it not be better to have one large division carrying through from the mining of minerals, processing of metals, and ultimately into the production of airplanes, tanks, and other end items?

b. The propriety of the division of labor or allocation of responsibility as it pertains to industrial equipment; for example, would it not be better for Materials Division instead of Industrial Division to conduct research on ferrous metals, chemicals, and other processing equipment? (The answer to this question stressed the advantage of the division of intelligence fields according to the functions of the ministries of the Soviet Union.)

c. The degree to which Materials Division was satisfied with their relationships with others in the intelligence community working on common problems.

d. The degree of satisfaction felt by the division with the collection activities serving its needs.

5. The Clark Committee Representatives next met with Chief and Deputy Chief of Analysis Division together with the Branch chiefs of that division, from 1450 to 1540. During this meeting, there was no discussion of T/O or other personnel problems, nor specific reference to possible duplications of activities. The following are the more important matters that came up for discussion:

a. Relationships between the Military Economics Branch and the military services (two specific papers were discussed as illustrations).

b. Information given consumers as to probable reliability of estimates.

c. Analysis Division activities in relation to the other divisions of the Economic Area.

d. Handling of sociological and psychological aspects of division estimates.

e. Definition of "Capabilities" as used in the Capabilities Branch. This division considered the Committee Representatives very receptive to the division problems and surprisingly quick in understanding the role and mission of the division.

6. Colonel Miller and Mr. [REDACTED] were with Chief, Geographic Research, and his Special Assistant from 1545 to 1620, Mr. McGruder having left at the completion of the D/A briefing. Colonel Miller seemed interested in the history and development of the facilities and functions of the Geographic Area but was concerned by the absence of formalizing directives. He wanted to know whether it would be advantageous to have an NSC or a DCID terms of reference. Ch/G informed Colonel Miller that the functions of the Geographic Area were, with the exception of certain coordinated E & E studies, largely in support of specialized CIA activities, the Services having counterpart activities to serve their particular needs. Interagency coordination of Geographic Area activities was explained, and Colonel Miller seemed to conclude that no useful purpose would be served by a formal terms of reference and he even doubted that any would be forthcoming if requested. A question as to why the Map Library was not under OCD was raised by Colonel Miller. He seemed satisfied when shown that it was not analogous to the other Registers in OCD. Aside from the foregoing, his questions were aimed at understanding the functions and interrelations of the Geographic Area.

25X1A

[REDACTED]
Executive, ORR

24 November 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Operations

SUBJECT: Mark Clark Committee Members' Visit to ORR,
24 November 1954

1. From 0910 to 1030, Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder met with Chief, Economic Research, and his division and staff chiefs. Ch/E outlined to them the organization of the area, the authority under which it operates, the consumers of its production, and procedures for accomplishing research. In general, Colonel Miller's questions were on who did what, how they did it, and why they did it. He did not seem at all concerned about substantive conclusions. In addition, Colonel Miller seemed not to be aware of, or at least not to appreciate the possibility of, determining actions by conference or by staff study and concurrences, such as decision in an EIC subcommittee as to what gaps could appropriately be filled by CIA, or decision among division chiefs as to which should be the action division. He seemed always to be seeking to learn who was the competent higher authority who issued all orders and made all decisions. Following are the more important topics discussed:

a. Colonel Miller was interested in the division of intelligence responsibilities under DCID 15/1, particularly military-economic research. He asked what percentage of total economic research on the Soviet Bloc was accomplished in ORR. While this exact percentage is difficult to pin down, we estimated that about 75 percent of the production within the economic sector of the intelligence community was carried out in ORR. Colonel Miller asked why we did not do the complete job and was told that the responsibility for military end items and certain other military specialties were the responsibilities of the individual Services, but that a merger with the Air Force would bring under one centralized direction over 90 percent of the personnel currently devoted to economic research on the Bloc.

b. Colonel Miller was interested in relationship with NSA and in reports which evaluated specific sources. Two of these have been completed and will be made available in this office to Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder if they decide to review them.

c. Colonel Miller was concerned about the timeliness of our Current Intelligence Support operation; after the general presentation in Ch/E's office, he spent about ten minutes going over the specific details of such support.

This document has been
approved for release through
the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM of
the Central Intelligence Agency.

Date 5/5/92HRP 89-2

010166

~~SECRET~~

~~EYES ONLY~~

2. The Committee Representatives next visited the Industrial Division, and were briefed by the division chief and by [REDACTED] from 1045 to 1200. The Committee Representatives were shown an organization chart of the division indicating commodities handled by branches, and were also shown a representative selection of published reports of this division. The following topics were discussed:

a. The T/O of the division and the ratio of clerical to professional personnel.

b. The question of conflicts or overlaps of division activities with those of the other IAC agencies.

c. The reason for the assignment of Techniques and Methods Division to the Coordination Area.

d. The relationship between D/I and the Industrial Register and the reasons why the Industrial Register was so far from this division.

e. Possible conflict between the work done in the Shipbuilding Branch (the only branch that time permitted the Representatives to visit) and ONI.

3. Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder were next briefed by the Acting Chief, Services Division, and his two assistants from 1330 to 1410. The following topics were discussed:

a. The division mission and functions, the definition of "services sector of the economy," number of branches in the division, and the division T/O with distinction between professional and clerical.

b. Reasons for T/O vacancies, and whether staffing was according to needs or according to a rigid T/O.

c. Possibilities of duplication in functions within CIA and within the intelligence community, particularly as to: whether Basic Division couldn't produce all the intelligence needed on population and manpower and what measures had been taken to avoid duplication with Department of State functions; the method by which the EIC subcommittee in this field operated; the number of studies produced in population and manpower within the last two years by agencies other than CIA; possible overlap between the interests of Services Division and those of Industrial in the Industrial Labor Force; and any measures taken to avoid duplication in other fields.

4. The Acting Chief, Materials Division, and his Deputy were interviewed by Colonel Miller and Mr. McGruder from 1410 to 1450. During the course of the discussion the following questions arose:

a. Would it not be better to carry straight through on intelligence coverage of ferrous metals into the production of end items, such as those handled by the Industrial Division? For example, would it not be better to have one large division carrying through from the mining of minerals, processing of metals, and ultimately into the production of airplanes, tanks, and other end items?

b. The propriety of the division of labor or allocation of responsibility as it pertains to industrial equipment; for example, would it not be better for Materials Division instead of Industrial Division to conduct research on ferrous metals, chemicals, and other processing equipment? (The answer to this question stressed the advantage of the division of intelligence fields according to the functions of the ministries of the Soviet Union.)

c. The degree to which Materials Division was satisfied with their relationships with others in the intelligence community working on common problems.

d. The degree of satisfaction felt by the division with the collection activities serving its needs.

5. The Clark Committee Representatives next met with Chief and Deputy Chief of Analysis Division together with the Branch chiefs of that division, from 1450 to 1540. During this meeting, there was no discussion of T/O or other personnel problems, nor specific reference to possible duplications of activities. The following are the more important matters that came up for discussion:

a. Relationships between the Military Economics Branch and the military services (two specific papers were discussed as illustrations).

b. Information given consumers as to probable reliability of estimates.

c. Analysis Division activities in relation to the other divisions of the Economic Area.

d. Handling of sociological and psychological aspects of division estimates.

e. Definition of "Capabilities" as used in the Capabilities Branch. This division considered the Committee Representatives very receptive to the division problems and surprisingly quick in understanding the role and mission of the division.

6. Colonel Miller and [REDACTED] were with Chief, Geographic Research, and his Special Assistant from 1545 to 1620, Mr. McGruder having left at the completion of the D/A briefing. Colonel Miller seemed interested in the history and development of the facilities and functions of the Geographic Area but was concerned by the absence of formalizing directives. He wanted to know whether it would be advantageous to have an NSC or a DCID terms of reference. Ch/G informed Colonel Miller that the functions of the Geographic Area were, with the exception of certain coordinated E & E studies, largely in support of specialized CIA activities, the Services having counterpart activities to serve their particular needs. Interagency coordination of Geographic Area activities was explained, and Colonel Miller seemed to conclude that no useful purpose would be served by a formal terms of reference and he even doubted that any would be forthcoming if requested. A question as to why the Map Library was not under OCD was raised by Colonel Miller. He seemed satisfied when shown that it was not analogous to the other Registers in OCD. Aside from the foregoing, his questions were aimed at understanding the functions and interrelations of the Geographic Area.

[REDACTED]
Executive, ORR